Docket No. **D/A1322** (1508/3380)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re PATENT application of	) Confirmation No.: 2257
P. Hamilton Clark III, et al.	)
Application No. 09/950,087	) Examiner: Johnna Loftis
Filed: September 10, 2001	) Group Art Unit: 3623
For: ELECTRONIC PROJECT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM USING PROJECT PHASES	) Date: January 24, 2007

APPEAL BRIEF

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF – PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal is from the decision of the Examiner dated April 19, 2006, finally rejecting pending claims 1-30, which are reproduced as the Claims Appendix of this brief.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the $500.00 government fee due in accordance with 41.20(b)(2), and any additional fees that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The Xerox Corporation is the real party of interest.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are presently no appeals or interferences known to the Appellants, the Appellants' representative, or the assignee, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-30 stand finally rejected and are the subject of this appeal.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been filed subsequent to the final rejection.

V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The claimed invention relates to a system and processes for managing projects electronically using project phases. The claimed invention involves, among other things, identifying exit criteria applicable to at least one project phase from ext criteria stored in the system and establishing the criteria for each project phase. Before advancing to a next one of the phases, a determination is made whether the exit criteria for that phase has been satisfied.

These and other concepts of the invention are broadly set forth in each of the following independent claims on appeal:

Independent Claims 1 and 13

Claim 1 is directed to a method for managing a project comprising creating at least one phase for the project (e.g., see Figure 3, item 60 and paragraph 0030 on page 9), identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project (e.g., see lines 4-6 of paragraph 0038 on page 11 and lines

8-15 of paragraph 0039 to line 6 of paragraph 0040 on page 12), and establishing the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase (e.g., see item 64 in Figure 6 and paragraph 0042 spanning pages 12 to 13), the one or more exit criteria based at least partially on experience gained from one or more prior projects (e.g., see lines 10-15 of paragraph 0038 on page 11). Claim 1 further recites determining whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase (e.g., see item 66 in Figure 6 and the description starting at line 1 of paragraph 0045, at page 13, to line 11 of paragraph 0047), and advancing the project to a next one of the phases based on the determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase (e.g., see lines 7-10 of paragraph 0014 on page 4, lines 5-9 of paragraph 0030 on page 9, lines 9-10 of paragraph 0038 on page 11, item 67 in Figure 6, and paragraph 0047).

Similar processes are recited in claim 13 with respect to a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon that cause a processor to perform the processes (e.g., see paragraphs 0019-0020 at pages 5 and 6). Thus, it is not believed further summary of claim 13 would be required for the purposes of this appeal.

Independent claim 7

Claim 7 is directed to a project management system (e.g., see system 10 in Figure 1 including one or more computers 12(1)-12(n) connected via a network 14 to server 16 (shown in more detail in Figure 2), and the corresponding description in paragraphs 0015 to 0022 on pages 4 to 6). The system comprises an interface system that creates at least one phase for the project (e.g., see paragraphs 0024 and 0030, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n) and respective display devices 13(1)-13(n) shown in Figure 1, the server 16 and memory 22 shown in Figure 2, and the exemplary Web page depicted in Figure 5 showing project phases 61(1)-61(7)), an identification system that identifies which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project (e.g., see lines 4-6 of paragraph 0038 on page 11, lines 8-15 of paragraph 0039 to line 6 of paragraph 0040 on page 12, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n) having respective display devices 13(1)-13(n), and the server

16 shown in Figures 1 and 2), a phase establishing system that establishes the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase (e.g., see paragraph 0042 spanning pages 12 to 13, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n), the server 16 shown in Figures 1 and 2, and the exemplary Web page shown in Figure 5), the one or more exit criteria based at least partially on experience gained from one or more prior projects (e.g., see lines 10-15 of paragraph 0038 on page 11), a determination system that determines whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase (e.g., see paragraphs 0045 to 0046, at pages 13 to 14, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n), the server 16 shown in Figures 1 and 2, and the exemplary Web page shown in Figure 5), and an advancement system that advances the project to a next one of the phases based on the determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase (e.g., see lines 7-10 of paragraph 0014 on page 4, lines 5-9 of paragraph 0030 on page 9, lines 9-10 of paragraph 0038 on page 11, paragraph 0047, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n) shown in Figure 1, the server 16 shown in Figures 1 and 2, and the exemplary Web page shown in Figure 5).

Independent Claims 19 and 27

Claim 19 is directed to a method for managing a project comprising identifying one or more project requirements (e.g., see item 30 of Figure 3 and paragraphs 0015 to 0022 on pages 4 to 6), creating a project strategy (e.g., see item 40 of Figure 3 and paragraph 0028 spanning pages 8 to 9), defining a time schedule based upon the project strategy (e.g., see item 50 in Figure 3 and paragraph 0029 on page 9), identifying and creating one or more project phases within the project (e.g., see item 60 in Figure 3, and page 9, paragraph 0030), and integrating the one or more phases with the time schedule (e.g., see item 70 of Figure 3, and paragraph 0031 spanning pages 9 to 10).

The method of claim 19 comprises identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project (e.g., see item 62 in Figure 6, and the description at lines 4-6 of paragraph 0038 on page 11 and lines 8

of paragraph 0039 to line 6 of paragraph 0040 on page 12), establishing the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase (e.g., see item 64 in Figure 6 and paragraph 0042 spanning pages 12 to 13), determining whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase (e.g., see items 66 in Figure 6, and the description in paragraphs 0045 to 0046, at pages 13 to 14), and implementing the project by advancing the project to a next one of the phases based on the determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase (e.g., see lines 7-10 of paragraph 0014 on page 4, lines 5-9 of paragraph 0030 on page 9, lines 9-10 of paragraph 0038 on page 11, item 67 in Figure 6, and paragraph 0047).

Similar processes are recited in claim 27 with respect to a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon that cause a processor to perform the processes (e.g., see paragraphs 0019-0020 at pages 5 and 6). Thus, it is not believed further summary of claim 27 would be required for the purposes of this appeal.

Independent claim 23

Claim 23 is directed to a project management system (e.g., see the exemplary system 10 shown in Figure 1 including computers 12(1)-12(n) connected via a network to server 16 (shown in more detail in Figure 2), and the corresponding description in paragraphs 0015 to 0022 on pages 4 to 6). The system comprises a project requirements system that identifies one or more project requirements (e.g., see paragraph 0024 on page 7 to paragraph 0027 on page 8, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n) having respective display devices 13(1)-13(3) that display Web pages generated by programming included in the server 16, for example, the Web page shown in Figure 5), a strategy creation system that creates a project strategy (e.g., see paragraph 0028 spanning pages 8 to 9, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n), the server 16 shown in Figures 1 and 2, and the exemplary Web page shown in Figure 5), a time schedule system that defines a time schedule based upon the project strategy (e.g., see paragraph 0029 on page 9, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n), the server 16 shown in Figures 1 and 2, and the exemplary Web page shown in Figure 5),

a project phase system that identifies and creates one or more phases within the project (e.g., see page 9, paragraph 0030, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n) having display devices 13(1)-13(n), the server 16 shown in Figures 1 and 2, the exemplary Web page depicted in Figure 5 including phases 16(1)-16(7), and memory 22 shown in Figure 2), and a project integration system that integrates the one or more phases with the time schedule (e.g., see paragraph 0031 spanning pages 9 to 10, server 16, and the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n) and respective display devices 13(1)-13(n)).

The system recited in claim 23 further comprises a project identification system that identifies which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project (e.g., see lines 4-6 of paragraph 0038 on page 11, lines 8-15 of paragraph 0039 to line 6 of paragraph 0040 on page 12, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n) having respective display devices 13(1)-13(n), and the server 16 shown in Figures 1 and 2), a phase establishing system that establishes the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase (e.g., see paragraph 0042 spanning pages 12 to 13, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n), the server 16 shown in Figures 1 and 2, and the exemplary Web page shown in Figure 5), a determination system that determines whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase (e.g., see paragraphs 0045 to 0046, at pages 13 to 14, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n), the server 16 as shown in Figures 1 and 2, and the exemplary Web page shown in Figure 5), and a project implementation system that implements the project by advancing the project to a next one of the phases based on the determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase (e.g., see lines 7-10 of paragraph 0014 on page 4, lines 5-9 of paragraph 0030 on page 9, lines 9-10 of paragraph 0038 on page 11, paragraph 0047, the one or more computers 12(1)-12(n) shown in Figure 1, the server 16 shown in Figures 1 and 2, and the exemplary Web page shown in Figure 5).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal are as follows:

A. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-25 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by McAtee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,301,320).

B. Claims 6, 12, 18, 22, 26 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as allegedly being obvious over the McAtee et al. patent.

VII. ARGUMENT

A. The Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-25 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as Allegedly being Anticipated by McAtee et al., should be Reversed

As instructed in the MPEP § 2131 and the caselaw recited therein, for a reference to anticipate a claim, each and every claim element must be described in that reference. The rejection cannot stand because the McAtee et al. patent fails to describe all limitations set forth in the pending independent claims, for the following reasons:

A Common Distinction Recited in Each of Pending Independent Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 23 and 27

On pages 10-12 of the response filed on February 1, 2006, Appellants pointed out that the parts of the McAtee et al. patent relied upon in the November 4, 2005, action (i.e., column 5, lines 25-30 and column 7, lines 17-33) do not describe, either explicitly or inherently, claimed processes including "identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project," as recited in independent claims 1, 13, 19 and 27, and claimed systems including an "identification system that identifies which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project," as recited in independent

claims 7 and 23. The Examiner does not consider these arguments convincing, for reasons given in the "Response to Arguments" section of the final action. However, the reasons provided by the Examiner are broad, conclusory, and unsubstantiated statements that do not address the specific claimed features discussed in Appellants' response. For example, the Examiner asserts:

> Applicant argues that McAtee et al. does not teach identifying one or more stored exit criteria that are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project. However, Examiner points to column 6, lines 7-61, wherein it is taught that the user interacts with the manager utility to enter key information pertaining to each goal. This information is entered into a data structured, stored and later used to create various computer programs that facilitate or actually carry out the tasks. Therefore, McAtee et al. does teach that the goals and criteria applicable to the tasks are stored to be later retrieved when building the computer programs. (See, lines 2-9 of section 3, at page 2.)

Appellants respectfully traverse these statements and any other allegation that the McAtee et al. patent describes that which is claimed. First, it is to be pointed out that Appellants did not argue "McAtee et al. does not teach identifying one or more stored exit criteria that are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project," as alleged by the Examiner. Rather, Appellants' response presented arguments that McAtee et al. "does not disclose the features of 'identifying <u>which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable</u> to at least one of the phases of the project'" (further emphasis added) (see, lines 25-30 of page 10 of the February 1st response) because, in contrast to the claimed invention, the McAtee et al. system involves a designer conceptualizing a workflow decomposition and creating a workflow template by way of interaction with a Manager Utility component (i.e., the "M/U") (see, line 12-24 of page 10).

Second, it appears that the Examiner, having realized that the parts of McAtee et al. previously cited do not describe what is claimed, now contends that column 6, lines 7-61 describes claimed features relating to identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the newly cited part of McAtee et al. does not teach the features recited in claims 1, 13, 19 and 27 of "identifying <u>which of one or</u>

more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project," and the features recited in claims 7 and 23 of "identification system that identifies which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project." Rather, the newly cited section of McAtee et al. relates to a designer entering key information data (i.e., entering goals and goal information into various fields) to create a "workflow definition database" and creating "the various computer programs (i.e., SWAs and CMAs) that facilitate or actually carry out these tasks" (see, column 6, lines 7-12 and 59-61).

The Examiner's assertion that McAtee teaches "goals and criteria applicable to the tasks are stored to be later retrieved when building the computer programs," is too general and thus does not disclose the specific claimed features relating to identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project. Furthermore, because a designer utilizing the McAtee et al. system appears, at best, to identify goals/tasks on the fly using the M/U prior to the creation of any program that carries out these goals/tasks (i.e., while creating the workflow definition database), even if these goals/tasks are retrieved at some later time to create a computer program, it is not by way of identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable, as claimed. Indeed, McAtee et al. discloses, at column 4, lines 4-18 and column 10, lines 7-14, that WIP-processing programs written by the designer (referred to as "software agents" (SWAs)) are associated with a name of a goal and scheduled by and executed under the control of Controller and Controller Services Interface (CSI) components, which process WIPs directly through the workflow activities as directed by the template constructed by the designer using the M/U. Furthermore, it would appear that a predefined goal or task would serve as a starting point for the designer at the time he or she creates an SWA for that goal/task and associates the name of the goal/task with that SWA. At that time, however, all the goals/tasks had been previously identified and set by the designer using the M/U, which, as pointed out above, does not involve identifying "which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project ...," as claimed. Hence, there would no apparent need in McAtee et al. system to perform a

process of identifying which one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one phase of a project when creating computer programs (i.e., SWAs). Accordingly, the Examiner's allegations concerning retrieval of stored tasks are not relevant to the combinations of specific features set forth in the independent claims.

Differences between the claimed invention and the system described McAtee et al. patent are further brought out in the next recited process in claims 1, 13, 19 and 27 of "establishing the identified one or more exit criteria for the at least one phase... ." This process refers back to the process of "identifying which of one or more exit criteria are applicable ...." An analogous analysis exists with respect to subject matter recited in claims 7 and 23 in the context of system components. In connection with these features, the Examiner refers to column 5, lines 45-50, which describes a process performed by the designer to form relationships between tasks to create one or more compound goals. However, these relationships are created by the designer when conceptualizing a workforce description and entering it using the Manager Utility (M/U) (see, column 5, line 67 to column 6, line 3). More particularly, McAtee et al. describes that compound goals such as those shown in FIG. 2 (e.g., "process order" 9 and "final check 23, goals 18a, 18b and 18c) are constructed by the designer by way of data field entry using the M/U by entering goals as a series of boxes or as a sequence of commands (column 6, lines 51-59). Hence, the processes described in McAtee et al. relating to compound goals do not involve identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project, much less establishing the identified one or more stored exit criteria, as claimed.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the above statements reproduced from the final office action do not demonstrate where the McAtee et al. patent describes, either explicitly or inherently, every feature set forth in claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 23 and 27, and hence also in the dependent claims. Absent such a showing, the pending Section 102 rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

B. The Rejection of Claims 6, 12, 18, 22, 26 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as Allegedly being Obvious over the McAtee et al. Patent, should be Reversed.

The Examiner also rejected claims 6, 12, 18, 22, 26 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as allegedly being unpatentable over McAtee et al. However, these claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 23 and 27, and are therefore allowable at least for the reasons pointed out above, and further for the combinations including additional points of distinction set forth by the additional features recited. Also, the McAtee et al. patent provides no suggestion or hint of the concept of identifying which of one or more exit criteria from stored criteria are applicable to one or more phases of a project, as pointed out above with respect to the independent claims. Even if one were to assume, for the sake of argument, that the Examiner may be proposing modifications to the system of McAtee et al. to meet the combinations of each and every claim limitation, the McAtee et al. patent not only fails to suggest these modifications, but any such change would appear to require altering the principal operation of the McAtee et al. system. Hence, the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness on several levels with respect to independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 23 and 27, and thus also claims 6, 12, 18, 22, 26 and 30. See MPEP § 2143.01.

Furthermore, the McAtee et al. patent mentions nothing whatsoever about "making information regarding the project available through at least one Web page provided to one or more project participants, the information being accessible to each of the project participants depending upon their role in the project," as recited in claims 6, 12, 18, 22, 26 and 30. To the contrary, it would appear that the McAtee et al. system involves only *a designer* in the process of designing goals and goal information associated with the workflow management system. That is, there is no mention in McAtee et al. of information regarding the project information being made accessible by other project participants, as claimed. Hence, each of claims 6, 12, 18, 22, 26 and 30 set forth additional, separately patentable subject matter not taught or suggested by either the McAtee et al. patent.

Additionally, the Examiner's allegation that "it would have been obvious ... to automate the manual process shown in McAtee et al. and modify it to include accessing information over the Internet ..." (see, page 7, lines 6-10 of section 7) has not been shown to have factual basis in the prior art. In any event, the alleged teaching of having information accessible over the Internet is too general and would not have provided motivation to modify McAtee et al. to arrive at the combinations specific features set forth in dependent claims 6, 12, 18, 22, 26 and 30 because there is no description or suggestion in McAtee et al. of any collaborative nature regarding "project participants." The Examiner's unsubstantiated suggestion to modify McAtee et al. so "project participants to access project data anywhere in the world," therefore, could have only have been arrived at by using Appellants' own disclosure against them, which is clearly impermissible.

Although some features of the system disclosed in the McAtee et al. patent may appear similar to the claimed invention, the whole of the subject matter set forth in the pending claims facilitates advantageous features not provided to a designer utilizing the system of McAtee et al. For example, the claimed invention allows for selecting from ideas and lessons of others, which were captured and memorialized from previous projects, which can be made available to users within or across teams. In contrast, McAtee et al. does not teach or suggest any mechanism or way to draw from such stored exit criteria in a process or operation identifying exit criteria applicable to at least one phase of a project. Consequently, the subject matter set forth in the pending claims related to stored exit criteria defines a <u>significant</u> departure from the methods and system described in the McAtee et al. patent.

Finally, it is noted that on page 2 of the Advisory Action dated July 12, 2006, the Examiner asserts that column 5, lines 5-50 of McAtee teaches "a designer breaking down <u>the stored business operations</u> into a series of goals" (emphasis added). This is simply not so. There is no mention whatsoever of "stored business operations" in the cited part of the McAtee patent, much less the actual claimed features of related to <u>stored exit criteria</u>.

The remaining rejected claims are allowable because they each depend from one of independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 23 and 27, and therefore include all the features of these independent claims.

For all the above reasons, the Sections 102 and 103 rejections based on the McAtee et al. patent should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/John F. Guay, Reg.# 47248/
John F. Guay

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051
Rochester, New York 14603-1051
Telephone: (585) 263-1014
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

The following is a complete list of all claims on appeal:

1. A method for managing a project, the method comprising:

creating at least one phase for the project;

identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project;

establishing the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase, the one or more exit criteria based at least partially on experience gained from one or more prior projects;

determining whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase; and

advancing the project to a next one of the phases based on the determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase.

2. The method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising modifying one or more of the identified one or more stored exit criteria to accommodate for project requirements.

3. The method as set forth in claim 1 wherein the enabling further comprises enabling the project to advance if the determination indicates that at least one of the identified one or more exit criteria have been satisfied.

4. The method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising tracking one or more problems noted for the project.

5. The method as set forth in claim 1 wherein the determining whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase further comprises:

monitoring progress of portions of the at least one phase of the project related to the identified one or more stored exit criteria; and

determining if the portions related to the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been performed, wherein the enabling is also based on the determining if the portions related to the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been performed.

6. The method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising making information regarding the project accessible through at least one Web page provided to one or more project participants, the information being accessible to each of the project participants depending upon their role in the project.

7. A project management system comprising:

an interface system that creates at least one phase for the project;

an identification system that identifies which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project;

a phase establishing system that establishes the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase, the one or more exit criteria based at least partially on experience gained from one or more prior projects;

a determination system that determines whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase; and

an advancement system that advances the project to a next one of the phases based on the determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase.

8. The system as set forth in claim 7 wherein the interface system modifies one or more of the identified one or more stored exit criteria to accommodate for project requirements.

9. The system as set forth in claim 7 wherein the advancement system enables the project to advance if the determination indicates that at least one of the identified one or more exit criteria have been satisfied.

10. The system as set forth in claim 7 further comprising a problem tracking system that tracks one or more problems noted for the project.

11. The system as set forth in claim 7 wherein the determination system monitors progress of portions of the at least one phase of the project related to the identified one or more stored exit criteria, and determines if the portions related to the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been performed, wherein the advancement system enables the project to advance based on the determining if the portions related to the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been performed.

12. The system as set forth in claim 7 wherein the interface system makes information regarding the project accessible through at least one Web page provided to one or more project participants, the information being accessible to each of the project participants depending upon their role in the project.

13. A computer readable medium having stored thereon instructions for managing a project which when executed by one or more processors, causes the processors to perform:

creating at least one phase for the project;

identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project;

establishing the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase, the one or more exit criteria based at least partially on experience gained from one or more prior projects;

determining whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase; and

advancing the project to a next one of the phases based on the

determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase.

14. The medium as set forth in claim 13 further comprising modifying one or more of the identified one or more stored exit criteria to accommodate for project requirements.

15. The medium as set forth in claim 13 wherein the enabling further comprises enabling the project to advance if the determination indicates that at least one of the identified one or more exit criteria have been satisfied.

16. The medium as set forth in claim 13 wherein the determining further comprises tracking one or more problems noted for the project.

17. The medium as set forth in claim 13 wherein the determining whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase further comprises:

monitoring progress of portions of the at least one phase of the project related to the identified one or more stored exit criteria; and

determining if the portions related to the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been performed, wherein the enabling is also based on the determining if the portions related to the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been performed.

18. The medium as set forth in claim 13 further comprising making information regarding the project accessible through at least one Web page provided to one or more project participants, the information being accessible to each of the project participants depending upon their role in the project.

19. A method for managing a project, the method comprising:

identifying one or more project requirements;

creating a project strategy;

defining a time schedule based upon the project strategy;

identifying and creating one or more project phases within the project;

integrating the one or more phases with the time schedule;

identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project;

establishing the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase;

determining whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase; and

implementing the project by advancing the project to a next one of the phases based on the determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase.

20. The method as set forth in claim 19 further comprising basing the one or more exit criteria at least partially on experience gained from one or more prior projects.

21. The method as set forth in claim 19 further comprising tracking one or more problems noted for the project.

22. The method as set forth in claim 19 further comprising making information regarding the project accessible through at least one Web page provided to one or more project participants, the information being accessible to each of the project participants depending upon their role in the project.

23. A project management system comprising:

a project requirements system that identifies one or more project requirements;

a strategy creation system that creates a project strategy;

a time schedule system that defines a time schedule based upon the project strategy;

a project phase system that identifies and creates one or more phases within the project;

a project integration system that integrates the one or more phases with the time schedule;

a project identification system that identifies which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project;

a phase establishing system that establishes the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase;

a determination system that determines whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase; and

a project implementation system that implements the project by advancing the project to a next one of the phases based on the determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase.

24. The system as set forth in claim 23 wherein the phase establishing system bases the one or more exit criteria on experience gained from one or more prior projects.

25. The system as set forth in claim 23 further comprising a tracking system that tracks one or more problems noted for the project.

26. The system as set forth in claim 23 wherein the interface system makes information regarding the project accessible through at least one Web page provided to one or more project participants, the information being accessible to each of the project participants depending upon their role in the project.

27. A computer readable medium having stored thereon

instructions for managing a project which when executed by one or more processors, causes the processors to perform:

identifying one or more project requirements;

creating a project strategy;

defining a time schedule based upon the project strategy;

identifying and creating one or more project phases within the project;

integrating the one or more phases with the time schedule;

identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project;

establishing the identified one or more stored exit criteria for the at least one phase;

determining whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase; and

implementing the project by advancing the project to a next one of the phases based on the determination of whether each of the identified one or more stored exit criteria have been satisfied for the at least one phase.

28. The medium as set forth in claim 27 further comprising basing the one or more exit criteria at least partially on experience gained from one or more prior projects.

29. The medium as set forth in claim 27 further comprising tracking one or more problems noted for the project.

30. The medium as set forth in claim 27 further comprising making information regarding the project accessible through at least one Web page provided to one or more project participants, the information being accessible to each of the project participants depending upon their role in the project.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

(None)

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

(None)